

S 10022

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 31, 1973

ings as may be necessary to cause the Wampanoag Indian Tribe of Gay Head to be officially recognized by the United States of America.

## RESIDENT HOME SITES

SEC. 18. (a) Upon petition therefor by any town, acting pursuant to a vote of a town meeting, the appropriate Commission shall, with the advice of the Governor and the Secretary and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, prepare a Resident Home Site Plan.

(b) A Resident Home Site plan shall—

(1) State the reasons for the establishment of the plan;

(2) Delineate the land area or land areas in the town intended to be utilized for carrying out the plan;

(3) Define the criteria by which town residents may avail themselves of the plan;

(4) Project the total number of sites envisioned by the plan; and

(5) Establish the fair purchase value of such sites for qualified residents.

(c) Upon approval of a Resident Home Site plan by the appropriate town, and by the Governor and the Secretary, the Secretary is authorized to acquire for fair market value the land area or land areas specified in the plan by any manner authorized by this Act. The Secretary of the appropriate Commission shall thereafter make resident home sites available for sale to qualified residents at the fair purchase value established in the plan. The difference between the fair market value and the fair purchase value shall be borne by the Secretary out of funds appropriated pursuant to section 20 herein.

(d) Any resident home site sold under the authority of this section shall be subject to a right of first refusal in the Secretary and the appropriate Commission.

## HUNTING AND FISHING

SEC. 19. (a) Hunting, fishing, and trapping on lands and waters within the Trust shall be permitted in accordance with the applicable laws of towns in the Trust area, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the United States, except that the Commissions, the Governor, and the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting, no fishing and no trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public health, public safety, fish or wildlife management, administration, or public use and enjoyment. Except in emergencies, any regulations prescribing any such restrictions shall be issued only after consultation with the appropriate agency of said Commonwealth and any political subdivision thereof which has jurisdiction over such activities.

(b) The Commissions and the Secretary shall leave all aspects of the propagation and taking of shellfish to the towns within the Trust area.

## APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 20. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act; not to exceed, however, \$20,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests therein, and not to exceed \$5,000,000 for development, both in April 1972 prices, for the first three years of the operation of the Trust, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1930. An original bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. Ordered placed on the calendar by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am

today introducing, for myself and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), legislation to extend for 1 year the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration created by the Congress as title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

The authority for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—will end on June 30 of this year. There are a number of proposals pending in both Houses of the Congress which would extend, alter, or significantly change the authority for this administration. One such measure would have the funding authorities of the present act merged into law enforcement revenue sharing payments to the States. Another proposes to channel increased Federal funds directly into local cities and communities, replacing the existing State block grant approach in most of the present programs. Other proposals, with perhaps less far-reaching changes, are before the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, which I am privileged to chair.

In view of the obvious controversial or at least differing character of the proposals before the subcommittee, and the short time remaining under existing authority, I feel that this bill may be the most expeditious way to guarantee that the LEAA program does not die and that the Senate has adequate opportunity to consider proposals for change.

We had hoped that the House—which started its hearings sometime ago—would have a bill over here by now, giving the Senate time to examine it along with other measures pending in the Senate. This would have possibly enabled us to have processed, reported, and enacted a bill before the end of next month. That possibility is now fading with the passage of time. In view of our present heavy schedule here in the Senate it now appears we will have to adopt some other course of action.

Mr. President, there has been a very significant amount of interest expressed recently in the Law Enforcement Education program administered by LEAA. The mail I have received indicates serious concern for the future of that program, concern particularly on the part of the men and women in law enforcement and on the part of the educational institutions taking part in the program. This program is presently serving some 95,000 students in more than 900 educational institutions across the Nation. Clearly, those who are presently taking part in the program and those who hope to do so in the future need to be assured of its continuation.

Under this proposed extension, the law enforcement education program could be continued in its present form and could continue to provide financial assistance to law enforcement personnel who are seeking to increase their skills and ability through higher education.

Under the 1968 act, moreover, each State is required to develop and submit to LEAA a comprehensive statewide criminal justice plan. This plan must be approved by LEAA before bloc grant funds are made available to implement the State and local law enforcement pro-

grams. The criminal justice planning process and the development of State and local programs is a year-round activity, which requires leadtime in term of the assurance of a specific level of Federal funding. The States are already well into the planning cycle for the 1974 fiscal year funding. This proposed extension will permit them to continue the planning activities and assures them that Federal participation will not be disrupted or suddenly expire with the close of fiscal year 1973.

It has been said that the cooperation between the various elements of the criminal justice system in the several States and the preparation of the annual State plans are among the most important contributions of the Safe Streets Act to law enforcement. It is critical that this planning process be maintained and encouraged through positive action to continue the Federal program of law enforcement assistance.

Mr. President, I do not view this extension as settling in favor of the status quo or even putting off the work that faces the subcommittee. Hearings have been scheduled for June 5 and 6 on the measures now before the subcommittee. I expect that the House bill will arrive shortly. The subcommittee fully intends to explore each of these measures and to process a comprehensive bill as soon as practicable. I note, too, that it will be possible to tailor carefully the effective date of innovative features of any legislation which emerges from our considerations. Needed reforms can, therefore, be put into effect without unnecessary delay or disrupting unduly the present programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this proposed legislation not be referred to committee, but that it go directly on the calendar. It is not my intention, however, to call this legislation up immediately. But as time goes on, if it appears that it will not be possible to complete action on the measures before us, I want to be in a position to act swiftly to guarantee that this program will continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) in the introduction of a bill to extend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act for 1 year following its expiration on June 30, 1973.

As the ranking minority member of both the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures and the Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for the budget legislation affecting the Department of Justice and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, I am deeply concerned by the rapidly advancing expiration date of this important program. A glance at the calendar indicates that there are fewer than 20 weekdays remaining for final legislative action.

On March 14 of this year, I introduced at the request of the administration the Law Enforcement Revenue Sharing Act of 1973. A comparison measure was introduced in the House by Representative HUTCHINSON.

May 31, 1973

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 10021

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. (a) The Trust shall be administered and protected by the Commissions with the primary aim of preserving the natural resources located within it and preserving the area in as nearly its natural state and condition as possible. No development by the Commissions shall be undertaken in the Trust area which would be incompatible with the overall lifestyle of residents of the area, with generally accepted ecological principles, with the preservation of the physiographic conditions now prevailing, or with the preservation of historic sites or structures.

(b) The Trust shall be administered and protected by the Secretary, as to his responsibilities, in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, except that the Secretary may utilize any other statutory authority available to him for the conservation, preservation, and management of natural resources to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Commissions shall coordinate their administrative activities both with each other, and with those of other Federal, State, and local government authorities and agencies operating in the Trust area.

(d) In the event that the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts either before or after enactment of this Act provide for the management by a regional agency of areas of critical planning concern, pursuant either to a special purpose act dealing only with all or a part of Trust lands and waters or to a general purpose state law, the Commissions may, with the concurrence of the Governor and the Secretary, suspend the application of all or part of the provisions of this Act, except Section 2 which shall not be suspended, for those lands and waters managed by such agency so long as the Commissions, the Governor and the Secretary are satisfied that such management will be consistent with the purposes of this Act.

## TRANSPORTATION AND GENERAL USES

SEC. 12. (a) The Commissions, together with the Governor, and the Secretary, shall make an immediate survey of public and private water and air access to lands in the Trust area, including that by the Woods Hole, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket Steamship Authority and by other public and private water and air carriers, shall make such recommendations to the appropriate body or bodies for legislative or administrative action as they deem consistent with the preservation and conservation purposes of this Act. Such recommendations shall include specific measures to limit the number of motor vehicles and passengers such carriers might otherwise transport to the Nantucket Sound Islands. Thereafter, regular and frequent surveys of such access shall be made, and such recommendations shall be made, as are deemed appropriate to maintain the unique values of lands and waters in the Trust area.

(b) No development or plan for the convenience of visitors to Trust lands or waters shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation and conservation of the unique values thereof: *Provided*, That the Commissions, the Governor, and the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the values of the Nantucket Sound Islands by establishing such public transportation systems, trails, bicycle paths, observation points, and exhibits, and by providing such services as they may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding, consistent with the preservation and conservation of such values.

(c) In any such provision for public enjoyment or understanding, the Commissions,

the Governor, and the Secretary shall not unreasonably diminish for its owners or occupants the value or enjoyment of any improved property within the Trust lands.

## PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 13. (a) In order to encourage and provide an opportunity for the establishment of natural and scenic preserves by voluntary private action of owners of lands and waters in the Trust area, and notwithstanding any provision in this Act or in any other provision of law, the Secretary's authority to acquire lands or interests therein without the consent of the owner shall be suspended when:

(i) lands or waters or interests therein which are designated as being presently or from time to time needed to carry out the purposes of this Act are irrevocably in the ownership of private nonprofit conservation, preservation, historic, or other organizations or associations, and the restrictions against development of such lands meet the standards referred to herein; or

(ii) lands or waters or interests therein which are designated as being presently or from time to time needed to carry out the purposes of this Act are, to the satisfaction of the Commissions, the Governor, and the Secretary and within twenty-four months after enactment of this Act, irrevocably committed to be sold, donated, demised, or otherwise transferred to such organizations or associations.

(b) Section 19 of this Act shall be suspended with respect to those lands and waters and interests to which subsection (a) of this section applies; and section 10 of this Act shall be similarly suspended whenever in the judgment of the Commissions its applicability will contravene the purposes of this Act or any provision of law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(c) The provisions of this section shall be applied only to those organizations and associations which are determined to be bona fide and general purpose.

(d) All of the provisions of this Act, except Section 2, shall be suspended with respect to any lands, waters, or interests therein so long as such lands, waters, or interests therein are within twenty-four months of the enactment of this Act irrevocably subject to a conservation restriction created, approved and recorded under sections 31 through 33 of chapter 184 of the General Laws of Massachusetts which forbids or in the judgment of the Commissions and the Secretary, as evidenced by their written approval of such restriction substantially limits all or a majority of the land uses referred to in clauses (a) through (g) of the first paragraph of said section 31.

(e) The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to the Commissions and the towns, and to private organizations and associations, for the purpose of establishing sound land use planning and zoning bylaws to carry out the purposes of this Act. Such assistance may include payments to the Commissions and the towns for technical aid.

## POLLUTION

SEC. 14. The Commissions, together with the Governor and the Secretary, shall cooperate with the appropriate Federal, State and local agencies to provide safeguards against pollution of the waters in and around Trust lands. Such safeguards shall include an immediate survey of the quality of ground water conditions in all or any part of the area of the Trust, and the necessary funds therefor may be drawn from the appropriations authorized by section 20 herein.

## NEW EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 15. (a) The Secretary, together with the Governor and the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, is directed to examine the Trust lands and waters forthwith for opportunities to experiment with, and to encour-

age development of, aquaculture of all kinds, including but not limited to, fish and shellfish and other associated activities; and to examine other new employment opportunities of any kind appropriate to the purposes of this Act. Funds appropriated to the Department of Interior, Commerce and Labor under the authority of this or other laws of the United States may be used for this purpose without restriction.

(b) The Commissions, the Governor and the Secretary shall to as great an extent as possible in the development of any regulations pursuant to the provisions of this Act encourage the maintenance and commencement of agricultural uses of Trust lands.

(c) The Secretary, in consultation and cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, shall investigate, and where appropriate establish, training and retraining programs suitable for residents of Trust lands.

## FREEZE DATE

SEC. 16. (a) Beginning on April 11, 1972, no construction of any improvement, whether for residential, commercial, industrial, or any other purpose, shall be permitted to commence on any lands classified herein as "Forever Wild". Construction of improvements shall be permitted on any lands classified as "Town Planned Lands" only upon the granting of specific approval therefor by the board of selectmen of the particular town, after a showing of the need therefor. Construction of improvements shall be permitted on any lands classified as "Scenic Preservation Lands" only upon the granting of specific approval therefor by the board of selectmen of the particular town, after a showing of the need therefor. Approvals granted by a vote of board of selectmen pursuant to a finding of need therefore and pursuant to a statement of justification therefor, shall subsequently be deemed valid by the Commissions and the Secretary.

(b) In the case of any hardship caused by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Commissions and the Secretary shall, on the basis of rules and regulations developed and approved by the Commissions and the Secretary, make a valuation thereof and shall award fair recompense to any individual for whom hardship is demonstrated.

## INDIAN COMMON LANDS

SEC. 17. (a) The Martha's Vineyard Commission is directed to establish forthwith an orderly program for determining the precise extent of Indian Common Lands on Martha's Vineyard. The program shall include a survey or surveys, and such other research or field work as may be necessary to establish the ownership and boundaries of the Indian Common Lands known generally as the Cranberry Bogs, the Clay Cliffs, and Herring Creek. Funds to carry out the program may be drawn from those authorized to be appropriated by section 20 or section 13(c) herein.

(b) Upon completion of this program, the Secretary is directed to acquire the Indian Common Lands by any manner authorized by this Act: *Provided*, That such power of acquisition is suspended for any such lands in the ownership of a member or members of the Wampanoag Indian Tribe of Gay Head.

(c) The Martha's Vineyard Commission and the Secretary shall thereafter hold in trust such land acquired as established by section 7 herein. At such time as the Wampanoag Indian Tribe of Gay Head is recognized officially by the United States of America, and subject to mutual agreement as to utilization of any land held in trust, the Martha's Vineyard Commission and the Secretary shall transfer such land to the Wampanoag Indian Tribe of Gay Head without consideration to be held in tribal trust status.

(d) Upon petition therefor by the Wampanoag Tribal Council, the Secretary shall undertake such studies and begin such proceed-

May 31, 1973

The Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures has set aside time on June 5 and 6 to hold hearings on the anticipated House-passed bill. It is hoped that we will be able to complete final action on the measure by June 30. However, the prospects of final action by the Congress prior to that date are extremely dim.

One reasonable interim alternative might be a simple extension of the Safe Streets Act to June 30, 1974. This will permit the State and local units of government, which have benefited so significantly under the existing law enforcement assistance program, to continue their comprehensive criminal justice planning and maintain the operation of crime-reduction programs with some assurance of a continuing Federal commitment to this effort.

Mr. President, I am certain that none of my colleagues wants to see this program end or would propose to abolish LEAA. Even those who have most forcefully advocated changes in the present Act have repeatedly asserted a conviction that LEAA should have a continued life. This attitude was made abundantly clear last September when I proposed an extension to the Safe Streets Act in anticipation of the very kind of difficulty and delay we are now experiencing.

I am certain that no one would argue that the existing law is perfect—that no modifications to the Safe Streets Act ought be considered. In fact, I am pleased to learn that the House subcommittee which is considering the law enforcement assistance legislation has tentatively agreed to language which would reduce the state and local contributions to the program. It is my understanding that the presently agreed-to proposal would provide for a 90 percent Federal share to be matched by a 10 percent State and local match instead of the present 75 percent and 25 percent matching. It would also provide for a 50 percent "buy-in" wherein the States will provide in the aggregate not less than one-half of the non-Federal funding. This provision would reduce even further the burden on local units of government and be one step toward a revenue sharing concept.

Additionally, there are other alterations in the existing Safe Streets Act which may be desirable, and they will be considered fully.

From the standpoint of the appropriations process we must provide both LEAA and the Congress with sufficient time prior to June 30 to begin consideration of a restructuring of certain portions of the administration's budget request. The administration budget proposal for LEAA was designed to implement law enforcement special revenue sharing and to operate with a reduced administrative staff. It might be necessary to consider a variation of that administration budget for LEAA to make necessary adjustments in personnel.

It seems to me that with the imminent expiration of the present Act and the possibility that the Senate will be unable to undertake adequate consideration of a House bill to deal with this matter, an immediate extension of the Safe Streets Act should be held at the

desk and duly acted upon as subsequent events require.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (for himself, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. CURTIS):

S.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the protection of unborn children and other persons. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The debate relating to introduction of the joint resolution appears at an earlier point in the RECORD.)

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 470

At the request of Mr. WILLIAMS, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to regulate the transactions of members of national securities exchanges, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define certain duties of persons subject to such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 651 AND S. 652

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I have worked against gun controls ever since I have been in Congress. I was the first Member of the House of Representatives to introduce a bill to repeal the entire Gun Control Act and I was the first Member of the Senate to do so this year. S. 652 would simply repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968, a law passed at a moment of national hysteria and a law that has proved to have no adverse effect on anyone other than the law-abiding citizen.

Recently the distinguished Senators from Arizona, Senator FANNIN and Senator GOLDWATER, have asked to cosponsor my bill. I welcome this support and respectfully request that their names be added as cosponsors to S. 652.

Additionally Senator GOLDWATER and Senator FANNIN have asked to cosponsor S. 651. I introduced this bill in an effort to take a more practical approach to crime in which a gun is used. S. 651 would require an automatic additional penalty of from 5 to 10 years for anyone convicted of using a firearm in the commission of a Federal crime. I am grateful to Senator FANNIN and Senator GOLDWATER for their support of this bill. I respectfully request that their names be added as cosponsors to S. 651.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. HUGHES, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, to amend the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act and other related acts to concentrate the resources of the Nation against the problem of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

S. 1318

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on March 22, 1973, Senator DOMINICK and I intro-

duced S. 1318, the Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act of 1973.

I first want to ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the following Senators be added as cosponsors of the measure: PETER V. DOMENICI, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, JOHN O. PASTORE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I am most pleased with the favorable interest this proposal is generating throughout the country. This includes endorsements from a number of prominent educators, including the superintendents from two of the Nation's largest States, California and Michigan. I ask unanimous consent that the letters from both Superintendent Porter of Michigan and Superintendent Riles of California be printed in the RECORD.

Finally, this proposal has also received editorial comments and endorsements. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials from the Frederick News-Post and the Baltimore News American in my State, together with a two part article carried by the Copley Newspapers, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Sacramento, May 11, 1973.

The Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,  
U.S. Senate,  
Committee on Commerce,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BEALL: Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to comment on the "Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act of 1973". I vigorously support the preventative approach to learning problems in general and reading problems specifically addressed in your bill.

Along with a great many educators, I have been much concerned with the increasing numbers of children who fail to reach even minimal standards of achievement in school. Too often for too many children, the costly pattern of failure is fixed as early as the third grade and continues until they become high school dropouts. As a result, we have developed in California an innovative plan for Early Childhood Education designed to restructure early elementary school programs to more fully meet the individual needs and talents of youngsters. The plan will concentrate on the basic skills of reading, language, and mathematics.

Your program of reading emphasis in the early grades addresses itself to the most basic educational problem facing too many youngsters. Such intensive reading programs with the use of reading specialists can only help to assure each child a sufficient level of reading achievement to guarantee educational success.

I have asked Don White, Deputy Superintendent for Congressional Liaison, to provide any assistance you might request on S. 1318.

Sincerely,

WILSON RILES.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Lansing, Mich., April 17, 1973

The Honorable J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BEALL: I have had an opportunity to review Senate Bill 1318 and the analysis of your legislation entitled "The Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act of 1973."

I am very impressed with the proposal, and certainly support the emphasis on reading.

May 31, 1973

In fact, I am so encouraged that I have requested my staff to consider modifications in our remedial reading legislation to reflect some of the accountability ingredients contained in Senate Bill 1318. You are to be congratulated on emphasizing the need for improved skills in teachers of reading and in emphasizing the need to demonstrate whether or not there are some programs that can better teach reading than others.

If I can be of any assistance in helping to move this legislation through Congress, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. PORTER.

#### EDUCATION NOTEBOOK I

(By Kenneth J. Rabben)

Elementary school pupils could improve their reading ability within three years through a broad-based attack on reading problems proposed by U.S. Sen. J. Glenn Beall Jr.

The Maryland Republican's bill, The Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act of 1973, S. 1318, recognizes that reading problems have many causes and it attempts to deal with their interrelationships.

Beall and co-sponsor, Sen. Peter H. Dominick, R-Colo., both on the Senate Education subcommittee, recommend spending \$176 million during the next three years to halt the inability to teach children to read.

Schools in the program would be committed to having pupils read at third grade level by the end of their third year in school.

There is no financial eligibility criteria. Pupils with reading problems from poor, middle-income and rich families would take part. Federal funds would be provided for demonstration projects in elementary schools with large numbers or high concentrations of children not reading at grade level. (A child is expected to grow a year in reading ability for each year in school. Youngsters in most city and many rural schools are a year or more behind.)

At participating schools, regular reading instruction in all first and second grades would be supplemented by not less than 40 minutes of additional instruction daily by reading specialists. Pupils in grades three through six with special reading problems would have regular classroom instruction supplemented by not less than 40 minutes of additional instruction daily by reading specialists.

In addition, all pupils in one urban and one rural school district somewhere in the nation would test further the effect of specialized, expert reading instruction.

The bill defines a reading specialist as someone with a master's degree in reading instruction and three years of successful teaching experience, including reading. Reading teachers who agree to become specialists can be used instead of specialists if not enough specialists are available. A reading teacher, the bill says, will have a bachelor's degree, 12 credit hours in reading instruction and two years of successful teaching, including reading instruction. Funds are to be provided for in-service teacher training.

Special intensive summer reading programs would be conducted by reading specialists or teachers for children below grade level or with reading problems. The senator found research showing that reading skills of children from low-income families drop significantly during vacation periods.

Schools in the program would be required to analyze why pupils are not reading at grade level and to determine "conditions that would impede or prevent children from learning to read." Diagnostic tests would have to be used to identify pupils not reading at grade level. School districts would have to develop plans with specific objec-

tives that would include children reading at the appropriate level by the end of the third year. Each year, participating districts would calculate, through use of objective reading measures, the extent to which the goals have been achieved.

For the first time, the federal government would require participating districts to publish aggregate test scores of pupils in the program, thus giving parents and other taxpayers some idea of the progress of pupils, their schools and school system. Individual scores would be available only to parents or guardians.

Parent participation is stressed.

When teacher aides are used, consideration would have to be given to hiring parents of pupils in the program on a rotating basis.

These provisions would be authorized \$50 million during the next fiscal year beginning July 1. In 1975, the bill calls for \$55 million and in 1976, \$60 million. More money is recommended for other sections of the bill.

The Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act of 1973 faces a tough, perhaps impossible fight without strong support from people who think public schooling can change the fact that:

In urban areas about 50 per cent of the children read below grade level.

Seven million elementary and secondary pupils are in dire need of help from reading specialists.

Ninety per cent of the 700,000 pupils who drop out of school annually are "poor readers."

About 18.5 million adults do not read well enough to follow simple directions; to complete employment and other important forms or to broaden their knowledge and brighten their lives through books and periodicals.

#### EDUCATION NOTEBOOK II

(By Kenneth J. Rabben)

The proposed Elementary School Reading Emphasis Act is a very comprehensive piece of federal legislation dealing with a major basic education problem.

In addition to providing grade school pupils with supplemental reading instruction from experienced specialists and teachers during the school year and in the summer, S. 1318 also:

Recognizes the importance of upgrading preparation of reading specialists and teachers and the principal's special role in improving a school's reading program.

Would establish a Reading Corps to increase the number of reading specialists and improve instructional quality.

Would provide a reading instruction course and study guide for teachers and parents to be shown over public television.

Provides for a Reading Improvement Center to conduct research into the how and why of reading and to develop new instruction methods.

Creates a presidential Reading Achievement Award for pupils reading at the appropriate grade level and for schools whose pupils do likewise.

This broad attempt to improve reading instruction would cost \$176 million during the next three years. It is not designed to replace regular classroom instruction in reading by regular teachers.

Much of the act's successful implementation would depend upon the U.S. commissioner of education.

John R. Ottina, the acting commissioner, who is expected to be confirmed in that job permanently, told a meeting of education writers on March 30 that he was not familiar with the proposal.

The act was introduced on March 21 by Sen. J. Glenn Beall Jr., R-Md., a member of the Senate Education subcommittee and is co-sponsored by Sen. Peter H. Dominick, R-Colo., another committee member. Sen. Beall and his staff spent a year preparing the

act and it shows a deep appreciation of the workings of public education in general and reading instruction in particular.

S. 1318 was filed as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 being considered for continuation, but it can be adopted separately if the ESEA is replaced by education revenue sharing as proposed by the Nixon administration.

The bill may be difficult to pass at a time when the administration is trying to reduce more than 300 special or categorical programs to about five and S. 1318 may not be supported by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The act wisely takes into consideration the hard lessons learned from Title I of the ESEA, aid to disadvantaged children, the ESEA's most ineffective section and recipient of most ESEA funds.

One of Sen. Beall's aides explained that the senator is sympathetic to the revenue sharing approach and reduction of categorical programs, but he also believes that there remains a federal role to identify key problems and to point the way toward their solution.

The bill "addresses what I regard as the Achilles' heel of education, the massive reading problem of schools having large numbers or high concentrations of children reading below grade level," Sen. Beall said.

"A society like ours, where technology and education are so important and where only five per cent of the jobs are unskilled, cannot allow the dangerous condition of having massive numbers of children who lack the ability to read and thus the ability to learn and to earn."

The bill and the senator's remark provide yet another sad commentary on what passes for public education not only in kindergarten through 12th grade, but in teacher preparation institutions as well.

S. 1318 places considerable emphasis on credentials, ignoring the many classroom teachers who have been doing an outstanding job of reading instruction and who might not want to chase college credits for "specialist" status and higher pay.

It also must make the public question once again the claim by schoolmen that they know how to educate the nation's children. Some parents and other taxpayers will wonder whether such a massive effort should be undertaken by the federal government.

Given the concept of a monopolistic bureaucratic, government-controlled public school system, will \$176 million and supplemental instruction from reading specialists make a difference?

[From the Frederick (Md.) News,  
Mar. 22, 1973]

#### TEACH AMERICA TO READ

The acute seriousness of the reading problems facing the nation—yes, Johnny still can't read well enough—has finally been brought to the attention of the nation . . . and rather forcefully by U.S. Senator J. Glenn Beall, Jr.

The Republican Senator from Maryland Wednesday proposed the establishment of special reading programs to teach reading skills in the elementary grades in order to overcome what he correctly described as "the massive reading problem" in American schools.

How right he is when he states that "reading is the single most important skill, the single most important key to learning."

And how descriptively accurate when he labels the lack of proper training in reading skills as "the Achilles' Heel of Education," and is there anyone who does not know that the great warrior Achilles was vulnerable only in one place—his heel.

Obviously Senator Beall has hit a tender spot with the people at least in Frederick County, because within minutes after the public announcement Wednesday of his pro-